UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,162	03/13/2006	Daisuke Sogabe	KC-US030568	3665
	7590 08/04/200 OUNSELORS, LLP		EXAMINER	
1233 20TH STE	REET, NW, SUITE 700		AHMED, MASUD	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,162	SOGABE, DAISUKE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MASUD AHMED	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 M     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,8 and 9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 13 March 2006 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	r election requirement. r. a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	2 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statement submitted by the applicant on 03/29/2006.

## Claim Objections

1. Claims 4-7 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 7 for instance depends from another multiple dependent claim 6. Each of the multiple dependent claims depending on another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-7 have not been further treated on the merits.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi JP 10-211359.

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 9, Hiroshi teaches a video game play-by-play commentary system having the following limitations:

A video game program for causing a computer to implement a video game which displays a character on a monitor, and in which the operation of the character can be controlled, the video game program comprising:

a terminology storing function for storing running commentary terminology used while the video game is in progress (para 0005);

Page 3

a first running commentary function for performing play-by-play or commentary relating to the video game using the running commentary terminology (para 0071);

a running commentary interrupting function for interrupting the first running commentary function when specific events have occurred while the video game is in progress (para 0029-0032);

a second running commentary function for performing play-by-play or commentary relating to the specific events when the running commentary interrupting function has been executed (para 0029-0032);

a running commentary returning function for causing a return from the second running commentary function to the first running commentary function (para 0064); and

a running commentary continuing function for causing the continuation of the play-by-play or commentary by the first running commentary function which was interrupted by the running commentary interrupting function, when the running commentary returning function has been executed (para 0033-0036).

Hiroshi is silent on clearly disclosing the interruption function of the commentary, however Hiroshi does explain the condition change during the game play which can be considered as a commentary interruption and therefore it would have been obvious to ordinary skilled artisan to include an interruption commentary if the game is being

interrupted and then get back to the normal commentary of the game just as a live broadcast of a game.

Regarding claim 2, Hiroshi teaches

a first terminology selecting function for selecting the running commentary terminology stored in the terminology storing function (para 0005);

a first selected terminology storing function for storing the running commentary terminology selected by the first terminology selecting function (para 0015);

a first audio output function for converting to sound and outputting the running commentary terminology stored in the first selected terminology storing function (0015); and

a first transmission function for transmitting the running commentary terminology from the first selected terminology storing function to the first audio output function (para 0021).

Regarding claim 3,Hiroshi teaches the running commentary continuing function causes the continuation of the play-by-play or commentary of the first running commentary function, based on the running commentary terminology stored in the first selected terminology storing function of the first running commentary function (para 0037 and 0063).

Art Unit: 3714

The claims limitations of claims 4-7 seem to be similar to the claims limitations that are addressed by the examiner above. Even though claims 4-7 are objected to, they are also rejected at least for the reasons cited above by the examiner.

Applicant is respectfully advised to review the entire prior art of record very closely to better recite the claim language and distinguish the invention over prior art of record as supported by the disclosure.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MASUD AHMED whose telephone number is (571)270-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm, Alt Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571 272 7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,162 Page 6

Art Unit: 3714

/M. A./ Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/XUAN M. THAI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714